



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/612,484	07/02/2003	Candice B. Kissinger	P00727-US-01 (00872.0010)	3493
22446	7590	01/25/2006	EXAMINER	
ICE MILLER LLP ONE AMERICAN SQUARE, SUITE 3100 INDIANAPOLIS, IN 46282-0200			DESANTO, MATTHEW F	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER

3763

DATE MAILED: 01/25/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/612,484

Applicant(s)

KISSINGER ET AL.

Examiner

Matthew F. DeSanto

Art Unit

3763

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 October 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-42 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 18-40 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17, 41 and 42 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. This application contains claims 18-40 are drawn to an invention nonelected without traverse in Paper dated 11/19/04. A complete reply to the final rejection must include cancellation of nonelected claims or other appropriate action (37 CFR 1.144) See MPEP § 821.01.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-3, 14, 15, 41, and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reilly et al. (USPN 6,767,319), and further in view of Fahy et al. (USPN 6,187,529).

Reilly et al. discloses at least one syringe, at least one fluid reservoir, at least one valve, and at least one catheter, wherein the catheter is disposable (Figures 1A and entire reference), but Reilly et al. fails to disclose the use of pinch valves as the valves in the system.

Fahy et al. discloses the use of pinch valves instead of stopcock valves in a system that deals with infusing or perfusing fluids into organs or tissues. Fahy et al. discloses the benefit of using pinch valves also.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the system of Reilly et al. with Fahy et al. because Fahy et al. discloses the benefit of using a pinch type valve, which is the easy removal of the valve from the tubing (Fahy et al. Column 17, lines 21-38).

4. Claims 1-9, 12-17, and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lang (USPN 5,609,572), and further in view of Fahy et al. (USPN 6,187,529).

Lang discloses at least one syringe, at least one fluid reservoir, at least one valve, and at least one catheter that is disposable, as well as multiple syringes, valves, fluid reservoirs, and syringe pumps and wherein the configuration is the same as the applicant's invention (Figures 7A, 9 and entire reference), but Lang fails to disclose the use of pinch valves.

Fahy et al. discloses the use of pinch valves instead of stopcock valves in a system that deals with infusing or perfusing fluids into organs or tissues. Fahy et al. discloses the benefit of using pinch valves also.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the system of Lang with Fahy et al. because Fahy et al. discloses the benefit of using a pinch type valve, which is the easy removal of the valve from the tubing (Fahy et al. Column 17, lines 21-38)

5. Claims 10-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reilly et al. in view of Fahy et al. as applied to the claims above, and further in view of Lang.

Reilly et al. and Fahy et al. discloses the claimed invention except for the use of multiple syringes with multiple valves associated with each syringe in the system.

Lang discloses the multiple syringes and multiple valves (Figures 7A, 9 and entire reference).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the system of Reilly et al. and Fahy et al. with the teachings of Lang because Lang discloses the benefit of having multiple syringes with multiple valves to allow better regulation and control of many different types of medication, especially medication that are incompatible infusion solutions (column 2, lines 17-30).

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within


TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Matthew F. DeSanto whose telephone number is 571-272-4957. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nick LUCCHESI can be reached on (571) 272-4977. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Matthew DeSanto
Art Unit 3763
January 23, 2006



NICHOLAS D. LUCCHESI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 100